

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-2, 4, 9, 13-14, 16, and 20-21 remain in this application. Claims 1, 4, 38, and 39 have been amended. Amended claims and new claim 40 are supported in the application as filed. Claims 2, 3, 5-8, 10-12, 15, 17-19, and 22-37 have been cancelled.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the present claim amendments. No new matter has been added. New claim 40 is supported by original claims 3 and 4 and the specification as filed.

§ 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 13-14, 16, and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,824,866 (*Glazer*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,885,431 (*Renfrew*). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Glazer* in view of *Renfrew*, as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,990,302 (*Kuroita*). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner rejected claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Glazer* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,129,603 (*Sun*). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner rejected claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Glazer* in view of *Sun* as applied to claim 38 above and further in view of *Renfrew*. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 13, 22, 25, 31, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,306,348 (*Havens*) in view of *Renfrew*. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Havens* in view of *Renfrew* and further in view of *Kuroita*. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner rejected claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Havens* in view of *Sun*. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner rejected claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Havens* in view of *Sur* as applied to claim 38 above and further in view of *Renfrew*. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

None of the references, alone or in combination, provide all the recited claim elements, provide a teaching, suggestion or motivation for the claimed invention, or provide a reasonable expectation of success.

Applicant respectfully submits that the above § 103 rejections are overcome, or alternatively are moot, in view of the present claim amendments. Accordingly, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the above remarks, the remarks of record, and those in the advisory action.

Conclusion

The claims are believed to be in a condition for allowance and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that a two month extension of time is necessary to make this Reply timely. Should applicant be in error, applicant respectfully requests that the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Reply timely, and hereby authorizes the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys, Deposit Account 03-3325.

Please direct any questions or comments to John L. Haack at (607) 974-3673.

Respectfully submitted,



John L. Haack
Attorney for Assignee
Registration Number: 36,154
Corning Incorporated
SP-TI-03-1
Corning, NY 14831
Phone: (607) 974-3673

DATE: September 29, 2008